

REMARKSStatus of the Application

Claims 1-20 are currently pending in the present application and claims 1, 8, 10, 16, 17, and 18 are amended. Support for the amendments in claims 1, 10, and 17 is found at least in the originally filed application in originally filed claims 8 and 16 and par. 6 of the published application. Support for the amendments of claims 8, 16, and 18 is found in the originally filed application at par. 15 of the published application. Thus, applicants representatives believe no new matter is added.

In the outstanding Office Action, claims 1-2, 5-10, and 13-19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as anticipated by Komski (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0220970 A1); claims 3-4 and 11-12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Komski in view of Nathan et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,308,204, “Nathan”); and claim 20 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Komski in view of Lerner (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0032904).

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejections of claims 1-2, 5-10, and 13-19 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as anticipated by Komski. Independent claim 1 has been amended to recite:

A video entertainment satellite network system comprising:
a plurality of video entertainment satellite systems, each
video entertainment satellite system comprising a video
jukebox adapted to receive inputs from a plurality of input
devices and send output to a plurality of output devices; and
a satellite communication device;
wherein each video entertainment satellite system is
adapted to communicate with other video entertainment
satellite systems through a satellite communication network by
the satellite communication device;
wherein the plurality of input devices includes at least ***a karaoke video camera configured to capture and transmit karaoke performance images.***

The outstanding Office Action at page 4, lines 5-6 asserts par. 23 of Komski describes a plurality of input devices including at least a video camera. While Komski describes a video camera as an input Komski is silent as to Karaoke devices and, in particular, Komski does not

describe *a karaoke video camera configured to capture and transmit karaoke performance images*. Karaoke performance images are images which include a person performing to music provided by a karaoke machine which has the words of the songs visible on a screen so the performer can sing along to the karaoke music. Karaoke music is music of a popular song which is missing the lyrical content. The performer provides the lyrical content, so that this lyrical content and the performer's visual performance is captured and transmitted via the *karaoke camera configured to capture and transmit karaoke performance images*. Also, the karaoke camera may capture and transmit other karaoke performance images, such as the karaoke text of the words to the songs for which the music is presented. Accordingly, as Komski does not describe, teach, or suggest *a karaoke video camera configured to capture and transmit karaoke performance images*, Komski fails to disclose every feature recited in Applicant's amended claim 1. Independent claims 10 and 17 also include this feature.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 10, and 17 and claims dependent therefrom, are allowable. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 1-2, 5-10, and 13-19 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as anticipated by Komski be withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103

In addition, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejection of claims 3-4 and 11-12 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Komski in view of Nathan as claims 3-4 are dependent upon claim 1 and claims 11-12 are dependent on claim 10. As discussed above, amended claims 1 and 10 are believed to be allowable. While Nathan was not cited as describing this feature, for purposes of expediting prosecution, it is respectfully submitted that Nathan does not supply the claimed feature identified as deficient in Komski. Nathan is directed to a packet protocol method for communicating juke-box information between juke box units. (Nathan, col. 3, lines 24-30.) Nathan describes only the use of a microphone 55 which may allow use as a public address system or karaoke machine. (Nathan, Fig. 1, col. 6, lines 5-9.) Microphones have no video functionality. The microphone of Nathan is not a "*karaoke video camera configured to capture and transmit karaoke performance images*," as recited in amended claim 1.

It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 3-4 and 11-12 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Komski in view of Nathan be withdrawn.

In addition, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejection of claim 20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Komski in view of Lerner as claim 20 is dependent upon claim 17. As discussed above, amended claim 17 is believed to be allowable. While Lerner was not cited as describing this feature, for purposes of expediting prosecution, it is respectfully submitted that Lerner does not supply the claimed feature identified as deficient in Komski. Lerner is directed to a method of collecting viewer habit data. Lerner does not describe any video input devices, much less the claimed “*karaoke video camera configured to capture and transmit karaoke performance images.*”

It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejection of claim 20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Komski in view of Lerner be withdrawn.

Conclusion

Applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance. If there is any matter that the Examiner would like to discuss, he or she is invited to contact the undersigned representative at the telephone number set forth below.

Dated: April 4, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By _____
Milena Sukovic

Registration No.: 60,532
MARSHALL, GERSTEIN & BORUN LLP
233 S. Wacker Drive, Suite 6300
Sears Tower
Chicago, Illinois 60606-6357
(312) 474-6618
Attorney for Applicants